

REMARKS

Claims 16 and 30 have been canceled without prejudice. Claims 17-29 have been amended, and New Claims 31-32 have been added. Support for the amendments and new claims can be found at least in Figure 1 and paragraph 44 of the published application. Applicant requests entry of the amendments and reconsideration of the rejections in light of the following remarks.

Discussion of Claims Rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

Claims 16, 23, 24, and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Figov et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,989,854). Applicant respectfully disagrees. Figov discusses a laser printing system for applying ink to a printing member. See Abstract. Solely to expedite prosecution, Claim 16 has been canceled, rendering these rejections moot.

Applicant respectfully submits that Figov does not disclose all of the elements of new Claim 31. For example, Figov does not disclose a laser marking system configured to mark a substrate, where the system has a laser light emitting source, a substrate formed of at least one of paper, a sheet form, synthetic paper and resin film, means for displacing said substrate relative to said laser light emitting source, wherein the displacing means is configured to expose a surface of the substrate to light from the laser light emitting source, and the exposed surface is sufficiently sensitive to light from the laser light emitting source that, when exposed, energy is absorbed at at least one point of said substrate, whereby a reaction occurs which marks the exposed surface, and means for transmitting light from said laser light emitting source to the exposed surface, wherein said laser light emitting source comprises an array of lasers arranged for simultaneous multi-point marking, and said array of lasers comprise semi-conductor laser diodes configured to emit light in at least one of the infra red and near infra red spectrums.

The system of Figov uses ink for printing. See column 7, lines 18-23. The ink is placed on a drum using a laser, and the ink is transferred from the drum to a recording medium (e.g. paper). See column 13, lines 19-26. In contrast, embodiments of Claim 31 mark a recording medium with a laser. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 31 overcomes Figov and is in condition for allowance. In addition, Applicant respectfully submits that New Claim 32 is in condition for allowance for reasons similar to those discussed above with respect to Claim 31. Furthermore, Applicant does not agree with the characterization of the cited art

with regard to these dependent claims, and submits that the dependent claims are in condition for allowance because of the features which they each inherit from the independent claim from which they depend and for their own features.

Discussion of Claims Rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 16-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Manley et al. (EP Pub. No. 0818308) in view of at least one of Sasaki (U.S. Patent No. 6,670,978), Figov, De Bock et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,893,018), and Goldberg (U.S. Patent No. 4,383,261). Applicant respectfully disagrees. Solely to expedite prosecution, Claim 16 has been canceled, rendering these rejections moot.

Applicant respectfully submits that these combinations do not disclose all of the features of new Claim 31. For example, no combination of these references discloses at least those features discussed above with regard to Figov alone. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 31 overcomes these combinations and is in condition for allowance. In addition, Applicant does not agree with the characterization of the cited art with regard to the dependent claims, and submits that the dependent claims are in condition for allowance because of the features which they each inherit from the independent claim from which they depend and for their own features.

Discussion of New Claim 32

Applicant respectfully submits that New Claim 32 is in condition for allowance at least for the reasons discussed above with regard to New Claim 31.

Conclusion

Applicant has endeavored to address all of the Examiner's concerns as expressed in the outstanding Office Action. In light of the above amendments and remarks, reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections is respectfully requested. If the Examiner has any questions which may be answered by telephone, he is invited to call the undersigned directly.

Although the present communication may include alterations to the application or claims, or characterizations of claim scope or referenced art, Applicant is not conceding in this application that new claims are not patentable over the cited references. Rather, any alterations or characterizations are being made to facilitate expeditious prosecution of this application.

Applicant reserves the right to pursue at a later date any Currently Amended or other broader or narrower claims that capture any subject matter supported by the present disclosure, including subject matter found to be specifically disclaimed herein or by any prior prosecution. Accordingly, reviewers of this or any parent, child or related prosecution history shall not reasonably infer that Applicant has made any disclaimers or disavowals of any subject matter supported by the present application.

Please charge any additional fees, including any fees for additional extension of time, or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 11-1410.

Respectfully submitted,

KNOBBE, MARTENS, OLSON & BEAR, LLP

Dated: 2/27/09

By: Paul C. Steinhardt

Paul C. Steinhardt
Registration No. 30,806
Attorney of Record
Customer No. 20,995
(619) 235-8550

6713011
022609